

Application Serial No: 09/983,047 Attorney Docket No. 78381
In reply to Office Action of 03 September 2003

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9 and 11-14 are rejected. Claims 3, 7 and 10 are objected to. The present amendment amends claims 3, 4, 6, 7 and 10. It cancels claims 1, 2 and 11-14.

The Examiner requested that Applicant update the status of application serial no. 09/983,046. By the present amendment, the status of this application has been updated to indicate that it has now matured into a patent.

The amendment of the specification at page 8, lines 15-20 and the related amendment to claim 10 limiting "legs" to a serpentine configuration were volunteered by Applicants as the result of the telephone consultation discussions with the Examiner which are referred to on the first page of this amendment. They are the result of the Examiner incidentally questioning whether the specification provided an antecedent basis for "legs". Upon review Applicant realized the claim could be amended to improve its particularity and that coordination of the language of the specification with amended claim could be improved. There was no discussion whatsoever that the claim amendment would avoid prior art. No new matter is introduced.

Claims 4-6, 8 and 9 (which Applicant continue to prosecute) stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

7 of 9

Application Serial No: 09/983,047 Attorney Docket No. 78381
In reply to Office Action of 03 September 2003

rejected by Shroeder et al (ref. A: U.S. Patent No.
6,218,651).

Claims 3, 7 and 10 stand objected to as being
dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be
allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of
the limitations of the base claim and any intervening
claims.

The foregoing rejections and objections are traversed
by the present response.

By the telephone consultation referred to on page 1
the Examiner gave the Applicant permission in this Second
Amendment After Final to include arguments for allowability
of claims 5, 8, and 9 based upon Applicant rewriting claims
3 and 7 in independent form, and to likewise include
arguments for allowability of claim 4 and 6 after amending
the later to depend from amended claim 3.

Accordingly Applicants submit that since claims 5, 8
and 9 in their original form include all the elements of a
parent claim allowable over Shroeder et al parent, and
since amended claims 4 and 6 likewise contain all the
elements over such a parent claim, these claims at least by
virtue of these dependencies are allowable.

For the above reasons, all the claims remaining in the
case, namely 3-10, are now believed to be in condition for
allowance. Re-examination and favorable reconsideration in

8 of 9

Application Serial No: 09/983,047 Attorney Docket No. 78381
In reply to Office Action of 03 September 2003

light of the above amendments and comments are respectfully
requested.

The Examiner is invited to phone Michael F. Oglo,
attorney for Applicants, 401-832-4736, if in his opinion
such phone call would serve to expedite the prosecution of
subject patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

GREGORY H. AMES ET AL.

3 February 2004

By Michael F Oglo
MICHAEL F. OGLO
Attorney of Record
Reg. No. 20464